1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
6		
7	SHANNON L. TILLEY,	
8	Plaintiff,	Case No. 2:18-cv-00471-JCM-GWF
9	vs.	<u>ORDER</u>
10	NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	Plaintiff's Application to Proceed <i>In Forma Pauperis</i> (ECF No. 1)
11	Defendant.	Torma Tauper is (EeT 110. 1)
12		
13	This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis	
14	(ECF No. 1), filed on March 14, 2018.	
15	<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
16	Plaintiff alleges a claim against the Social Security Administration (SSA), challenging its	
17	denial of social security disability benefits. Plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant to this action,	
18	she was disabled as defined by the Social Security Act. Plaintiff claims that the Social Security	
19	Commissioner, initially and upon reconsideration, denied her requests for disability insurance	
20	benefits and supplemental security income. Plaintiff states that she timely requested review of the	
21	ALJ's decision with the Appeals Council, which was denied on January 11, 2018. Complaint (ECF	
22	No. 1-1), $\P$ 8. Plaintiff now seeks judicial review of that final agency decision.	
23	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
24	I. Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis	
25	Plaintiff filed this instant action and attached a financial affidavit to her application and	
26	complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Having reviewed Plaintiff's financial affidavit	
27	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the Court finds that Plaintiff is unable to pre-pay the filing fee.	
28	Therefore, Plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis in federal court is granted.	

## II. Complaint

Plaintiff brings suit against the SSA alleging she was wrongfully denied social security disability benefits. Federal courts only have jurisdiction to conduct judicial review of the SSA's final decisions. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Klemm v. Astrue*, 543 F.3d 1139, 1144 (9th Cir. 2008); *see also Cilifano v. Sanders*, 430 U.S. 99, 107–09 (1977). Plaintiff appears to have fully exhausted her administrative remedies with the SSA. The Court will therefore allow Plaintiff's complaint to proceed as a petition for judicial review of a final agency decision. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is **granted**. Plaintiff shall not be required to pre-pay the full filing fee of four hundred dollars (\$400.00).

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall file the Complaint (ECF No. 1-1).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall serve the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration by sending a copy of summons and Complaint by certified mail to: (1) Office of the Regional Chief Counsel, Region IX, Social Security Administration, 160 Spear Street, Suite 899, San Francisco, California 94105, and (2) the Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington DC 20530.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall issue summons to the United States Attorney for the District of Nevada, and deliver the summons and Complaint to the U.S. Marshal for service.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants shall have sixty (60) days from the date of service to file their answer or responsive pleading to Plaintiff's Complaint in this case.

...

26 .

27 | ...

28 .

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that henceforth, Plaintiff shall serve upon Defendant, or their attorney if they have retained one, a copy of every pleading, motion, or other document submitted for consideration by the court. Plaintiff shall include with the original paper submitted for filing a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of the document was mailed to Defendant or their counsel. The court may disregard any paper received by a district judge, magistrate judge, or the Clerk which fails to include a certificate of service.

DATED this 22nd day of March, 2018.

GEORGE FOLEY, JR. United States Magistrate Judge